



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,334	07/12/2001	Paul McAllinden	INTL-0609-US (P11750)	1583
21906	7590	03/27/2007	EXAMINER	
TROP PRUNER & HU, PC 1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750 HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631			ADDY, THJUAN KNOWLIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/27/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/904,334

**Applicant(s)**

MCALINDEN, PAUL

**Examiner**

Thjuan P. Knowlin

**Art Unit**

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>01/03/07</u>                             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                           |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. In regards to the Interview Summary and telephonic Interview between Examiner and Applicant's representative on 01/03/2007, the Abandonment of 12/22/2006 has been withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments, see page 6, paragraph 5, filed April 04, 2006, with respect to claim 11 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The previous Final Rejection of March 09, 2006 has been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's amendment filed on November 04, 2006 has been entered. No claims have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. No claims have been added. Claims 1-30 are still pending in this application, with claims 1, 11, and 21 being independent.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 8-11, 17-21, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nagasawa (US 6,782,281).
5. In regards to claim 1, Nagasawa discloses a cellular telephone (e.g., folding portable telephone apparatus, See Fig. 6) comprising: a first processor (See Fig. 6 and controller for pocket game 28); a second processor (See Fig. 6 and controller 22); a first

bus (See Fig. 6 and link/bus connecting the controller for pocket game 28 to the controller 22) coupling said first and second processors; and a device (See Fig. 1B and call start button 5a) to selectively bypass (for example, the controller for pocket game receives suspend instructions) the first processor (See Fig. 9, col. 5 lines 23-25, and col. 6 lines 13-25).

5. In regards to claims 2 and 19, Nagasawa discloses the telephone and method, wherein said first processor is an application processor (See Fig. 6 and controller for pocket game 28, for example, the controller for pocket game 28 allows the user to play and/or access games, which are considered forms of applications/programs, See col. 5 lines 17-22).

6. In regards to claim 3, Nagasawa discloses the telephone, including a keypad (See Fig. 6 and key operation area 26), said first processor coupled to said keypad to receive keypad inputs (See col. 5 lines 10-14).

7. In regards to claim 4, Nagasawa discloses the telephone, including a display (See Fig. 6, first display 4, and second display 8), said first processor coupled to said display to provide outputs to said display (See col. 4-5 lines 66-3).

8. In regards to claim 5, Nagasawa discloses the telephone, wherein said second processor is a baseband processor (See Fig. 6 and controller 22, for example, controller 22 performs the same functions as that of a baseband processor (See col. 5 lines 4-14).

9. In regards to claim 8, Nagasawa discloses the telephone, wherein said telephone includes a keypad (e.g., key operation area 26), keypad entries being provided to said first processor (e.g., controller for pocket game 28), said device (e.g., call release button

5b) selectively shunting (for example, turning off to one side or going around) said keypad entries to said second processor (e.g., controller 22) (See col. 5 lines 17-22 and col. 6 lines 21-25).

10. In regards to claim 9, Nagasawa discloses the telephone, including a display, said display coupled to receive outputs (e.g., games) from said first processor, said device (e.g., call start button 5a) to selectively bypass (e.g., suspend) the first processor to provide outputs (e.g., caller information, i.e., the telephone number of the caller or caller's name) to said display (e.g., first display 4) from said second processor (e.g., controller 22) (See col. 6 lines 13-20).

11. In regards to claim 10, Nagasawa discloses the telephone, including a display (e.g., first display 4 and second display 8) and a keypad (e.g., key operation area 26), said first processor (e.g., controller for pocket game 28) coupled to said display and said keypad and said second processor (e.g., controller 22) coupled to said display and said keypad through said first processor and said device (See Fig. 6 and col. 6 lines 13-35).

12. In regards to claims 11 and 21, Nagasawa discloses a method and article comprising: establishing communications between an input/output device (See Fig. 6, input/key operation area 26, and output/first display 4) and a first processor (e.g., controller for pocket game 28); in response to the detection of an event, providing said communications to a second processor (for example, the event may simply be an incoming call, in which the user presses the call start button 5a, which in return suspends the controller for pocket game 28, and thus allows the caller information, i.e.,

the telephone number of the caller or caller's name, to be displayed on the first display 4) (See col. 6 lines 13-20).

13. In regards to claim 17, Nagasawa discloses the method, including coupling said second processor (e.g., controller 22) to said first processor (e.g., controller for pocket game 28) and coupling said first processor directly to a keypad (e.g., key operation area 26) and a display (e.g., first display 4) (See Fig. 6).

14. In regards to claims 18 and 28, Nagasawa discloses the method and article, including selectively coupling (i.e., connecting) said display (e.g., first display 4 and second display 8) and said keypad (e.g., key operation area 26) directly to said second processor (e.g., controller 22) (See Fig. 6 and col. 6 lines 13-20).

15. In regards to claims 20 and 30, Nagasawa discloses the method and article, including providing a second processor that acts as a baseband processor (See Fig. 6 and controller 22, for example, controller 22 performs the same functions as that of a baseband processor (See col. 5 lines 4-14).

16. In regards to claim 27, Nagasawa discloses the article, further storing instructions that enable the processor based system to couple said second processor (e.g., controller 22) to said first processor (e.g., controller for pocket game 28) and couple said first processor directly to a keypad (e.g., key operation area 26) and a display (e.g., first display 4) (See Fig. 6, col. 5 lines 17-22, and col. 6 lines 13-17).

17. In regards to claim 29, Nagasawa discloses the article, further storing instructions that enable the processor based system to establish communications (e.g., games) between an input/output device (e.g., input/key operation area 26, and output/first

Art Unit: 2614

display 4) and a first processor (e.g., controller for pocket game 28) that is an applications processor (See col. 5 lines 17-22).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 6, 7, 12-16, and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagasawa (US 6,782,281), in view of Koenck et al (US 6,014,705).

19. In regards to claims 6, 15, 16, 25, and 26, Nagasawa discloses all of claims 6, 15, 16, 25, and 26 limitations, except, wherein said device selectively bypasses the first processor if the first processor fails to respond. Koenck, however, discloses said device selectively bypasses the first processor (See Fig. 2 and application processor 48) if the first processor fails to respond (See col. 20 lines 53-64, col. 26-27 lines 35-4, and col. 27 lines 5-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature within the system, as a way of providing backup in case failure occurs in the processor, thus allowing the user to maintain connection, and continue or establish communication.

20. In regards to claims 7, 14, and 24, Nagasawa discloses all of claims 7, 14, and 24 limitations, except wherein the second processor selectively bypasses the first processor to make an emergency call. Koenck, however, discloses the second

Art Unit: 2614

processor (See Fig. 2 and control processor 49) being selectively bypassed in the event of a power failure, battery low indication, or other "event" (e.g. emergency) (See col. 20 lines 53-64, col. 26-27 lines 35-4, and col. 27 lines 5-18).

21. In regards to claims 12, 13, 22, and 23, Nagasawa discloses all of claims 12, 13, 22, and 23 limitations, except selectively coupling keypad entries to a second processor when a first processor fails to respond. Koenck, however, discloses selectively coupling keypad entries to a second processor (e.g., control processor 49) when a first processor (e.g., application processor 48) fails to respond (See col. 20 lines 53-64, col. 26-27 lines 35-4, and col. 27 lines 5-18).

### ***Response to Arguments***

22. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bhat (US 6,097,955) teaches an apparatus and method for optimizing CPU usage in processing paging messages within a cellular communications system.


24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thjuan P. Knowlin whose telephone number is (571) 272-7486. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00pm.



Art Unit: 2614

25. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar can be reached on (571) 272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

26. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



THJUAN P. KNOWLIN  
PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600